

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

BONNY LOU BUZZELL)	
HUTCHINS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	1:14-cv-00536-JAW
)	
FOREST GOODWIN, JR. et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**ORDER AFFIRMING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On December 18, 2014, Bonny Lou Buzzell Hutchins of Bangor, Maine filed a pro se civil complaint in this Court against Forest Goodwin, Jr., Teddy Goodwin, Jeremy Goodwin, all of Fairfield, Maine and Ernest Roy Hutchins, Jr. of Clinton, Maine. *Pro Se Compl.* (ECF No. 1). Following the filing of the Complaint, the Magistrate Judge performed a screening function under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and on January 13, 2015, he issued a recommended decision in which he recommended that the case be dismissed for lack of federal jurisdiction. *Recommended Decision* (ECF No. 5). In the recommended decision, the Magistrate Judge acknowledged that Ms. Hutchins' Complaint could form the basis of a civil action, but concluded that the federal court did not have jurisdiction. *Id.* at 3. On January 29, 2014, Ms. Hutchins filed what the Court construes to be an objection to the recommended decision. *Mot. of Appeal to Proceed* (ECF No. 6). In that filing, Ms. Hutchins alleges in detail the

inordinate difficulty she and her extended family have experienced at the hands of the Goodwin family and their allies. *Id.* at 1-2.

But Ms. Hutchins has not explained why this Court, as opposed to the courts of the state of Maine, has jurisdiction. As the Magistrate Judge wrote, federal district courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and are allowed to assume jurisdiction over civil actions only if they fall within certain limited categories, including a case under the Constitution or laws of the United States or state law claims between citizens of different states exceeding \$75,000 in value. *Recommended Decision* at 3. Ms. Hutchins has given no indication as to how her claims fit within the limited grant of jurisdiction of this Court. As this Court does not have jurisdiction, it must dismiss her Complaint.

The Court has performed a de novo review of the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge and it concurs with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his recommended decision.

Over the objection of the Plaintiff, the Court AFFIRMS the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 5) and DISMISSES the Complaint (ECF No. 1).

SO ORDERED.

/s/ John A. Woodcock, Jr.
JOHN A. WOODCOCK, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 3rd day of February, 2015